DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 204 CE 080 659

AUTHOR	Kramer, Fredrica D.
TITLE	Designing a Family-Centered, Housing-Based Employment Program.
INSTITUTION	Welfare Information Network, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, MI.; Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, NY.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.; Woods Fund of Chicago, IL.; McKnight Foundation, Minneapolis, MN.; Administration for Children and Families (DHHS), Washington, DC.; Department of Labor, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	22p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.welfareinfo.org/krameraprildesign.htm.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses (070)
JOURNAL CIT	Design Brief; v1 n1 Apr 2000
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adults; Compliance (Legal); *Disadvantaged; *Education Work Relationship; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Housing Needs; Housing Opportunities; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Unskilled Workers; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	*Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; Welfare Reform; Welfare to Work Programs

ABSTRACT

This publication is designed to help TANF [Temporary Assistance for Needy Families] agencies create specific program interventions to serve TANF recipients in place-based (in particular, housing-based) programs that help welfare recipients find and keep jobs. TANF programs increasingly serve welfare recipients with multiple barriers to steady employment, who may require many types of services and interventions. The brief provides an overview of the following topics: supportive work environment, effective use of community connections, support services, staffing, space, and funding. Examples from successful programs are provided. A list of 25 references and 8 resource contacts is included. (KC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 204

Designing a Family-Centered, Housing-Based Employment Program

Welfare Information Network
Design Brief
Volume 1, no. 1 April 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE080659

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK

Design Brief

Vol. 1, No. 1 April 2000

DESIGNING A FAMILY-CENTERED, HOUSING-BASED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

by Fredrica D. Kramer

This is the first in a new publication series to help TANF agencies and others design specific program interventions to serve TANF recipients. The intent of this series is to offer a narrower and deeper level of specificity than the policy issues and program choices typically described in WIN *Issue Notes*. Nonetheless, it is impossible to fully appreciate the circumstances that may drive the choices to be made at the state or local level. Neither is it possible to address factors, such as organizational capacity, which will affect successful implementation even with the best of program designs. Thus, each *Design Brief* will offer a set of design principles that might guide those choices and a number of operating elements that planners can consider in developing a program to suit their needs.

Objectives and Scope

This *Design Brief* deals with place-based, in particular housing-based, programs to help welfare recipients find and keep jobs. The term "place-based" generally refers to programs located in and serving a particular neighborhood or community, often using community or economic development or other comprehensive solutions aimed to better that community.

For our purposes here we apply a narrower lens to "place-based," in order to focus only on housing-based programs engaged in employment and training, and within that sphere only on those initiatives where employment and housing are not merely coincident, but rather, interdependent. To amplify, while employment programs commonly locate in proximity to low income housing to ensure direct access to those in greatest need, it is ones in which critical elements of the design depend on being embedded in a residential setting that are of interest here.

The Problem

TANF recipients who remain on the rolls are increasingly those with multiple barriers to steady employment, whose work histories are often episodic and whose work prospects are therefore problematic, and who may require services or interventions not typically available in many employment and training programs. In addition, many recipients' work prospects may be influenced as much by the demands of children or other family members or other factors deriving from where and how they live, as by personal characteristics, and many of these factors may themselves be interdependent. Many live in

The Welfare Information Network -- Barry Van Lare, Executive Director
A Special Activity of the Finance Project
Tel: 202-628-5790 -- Website: www.welfareinfo.org -- Email Address: welfinfo@welfareinfo.org

areas of entrenched poverty, often isolated from economic opportunity, and with insufficient numbers of working adults on whom to model their own approaches to work and self-sufficiency.

Many also live in publicly subsidized housing. Public housing authorities (PHAs) have a large stake in TANF recipients' employment prospects. Recipients living in subsidized housing who reach their time limits to cash benefits without becoming self-sufficient will not lose their eligibility for housing assistance. Rather, they may become eligible for increased housing subsidies, thus putting a greater burden on PHAs, potentially destabilizing non-profit providers, and creating incentives to increase the tenancy of those less dependent on subsidies—in turn threatening the availability of housing for those needing subsidies.

Several programs sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) aim specifically at promoting self-sufficiency, and can fund supportive and other services for residents of public or assisted housing or in conjunction with community and economic development initiatives. However, TANF agencies and housing authorities are not characteristically experienced with each other's policies and programs, and may not be using funding opportunities to best advantage.

In addition, there is increasing interest among public policymakers at the federal and state levels and among private foundations in supporting initiatives to increase employment in communities of concentrated poverty. Supportive housing programs, designed initially in response to deinstitutionalization, are beginning to broaden their mission to address employment, and to apply lessons learned serving single individuals with special needs, such as homelessness, substance abuse or mental illness, to families in similar circumstance.

Capitalizing on the interdependence of employment and housing can serve at least three purposes. First, by operating within the area in which individuals live, programs can become knowledgeable about and connected with the contextual factors—such as the demands of children or family relationships—that make it more or less difficult for those individuals to engage in work.

Second, such programs may extend their reach to all working-age members who can contribute to the self-sufficiency of the TANF-assisted household. Many such individuals, most typically non-custodial fathers, may be reluctant to be identified as resident household members—potentially affecting housing subsidies, or contributions to spousal or child support. Ignoring them, as housing programs may do and welfare employment programs most often do, limits their potential in the long run to contribute to the economic and social stability of these families.

Finally, individuals with multiple barriers and extremely poor work histories may have complicated service needs but only episodic receptivity to assistance. A program whose message and services are omnipresent—as one in a residential setting can be—may be more able to meet the needs of such individuals on their terms, and in configurations of time and duration that adapt to and capitalize on their level of engagement. Individuals who are successfully engaged in work can in turn provide role models and job networks that improve the chances of others to get assistance.

Design Principles

The principles and practices offered below are drawn from a variety of programs. They include supportive housing for formerly homeless and those in treatment or recovery for substance abuse or mental illness, and service-enriched housing for low income populations more generally. They also include projects that have mixed community revitalization strategies with support services, others that focus

explicitly on employment assistance, and still others whose aim is saturation services to increase employment among all residents of areas of entrenched poverty.

The TANF population is as varied as the populations served by these various programs, and no one model can be lifted wholesale and applied here. Individuals who would have difficulty finding any job, and others with barriers to sustained employment, will require different service responses, as will those living in scattered sites, those in multi-family developments, and those in congregate housing where dining or other residential facilities are shared in common.

We borrow from place-based programs that take explicit advantage of the connection to home and family to suggest five governing principles:

- a holistic approach to services, that can be sustained over time;
- broad participation, to reach all those who do or can affect the ability of TANF recipients to sustain employment;
- an environment in which work is the norm, but one that can accommodate various and shifting work capacities;
- effective community connections to obtain jobs, services, and political support; and
- a broad funding strategy.

- **Holistic and comprehensive approach to services**

A holistic approach to services recognizes the client as part of a family unit, and is able to respond to his or her needs as they are impacted by family and community influences, as well as to the needs of multiple members of that unit.

Broad range of services. In addition to traditional employment and training services, a housing-based program can address a broad range of family and work management issues, take advantage of proximity to point of need in providing supportive services, such as child care close to home or at off-hours, and provide non-employment services directly to other family members to help the TANF recipient go to work. The program should be able to identify such service needs, incorporate them into the employment plan for the TANF recipient, and fund them largely with TANF dollars.

Commitment to long-term relationship and sustained services. Successful holistic interventions require a sustained presence over time in order to deal with short-term needs, crisis management, longer-term services that will support a steady course toward employment, and the often episodic receptivity to help that individuals with serious health or emotional issues may possess.

Housing-based case management facilitates sustained monitoring, and a view of the family as a whole to identify ongoing or emerging issues that impact employment. It can remain committed to the individual or family being served as long as he or she remains in the community, disentangled from participation in a particular program, and irrespective of his or her progress toward self-sufficiency. This approach begs effective collaboration between TANF and whatever institutional mechanism has created the housing, as well as sensitivity on the part of service providers to keep the relationship active but not intrusive.

- **Broad participation**

While the principal target for employment services may be the head of the TANF household, a housing-

based program can involve as many adults who can contribute to the income of the TANF-assisted household as possible, by using inclusive eligibility criteria, maintaining broad accessibility, aggressive outreach, and providing services that address the non-working needs of family members to allow employable adults to go to work.

Broad eligibility criteria. Employment services may be offered to all adult residents within the target community or to those who meet some income eligibility criterion, including a poverty standard for the neighborhood or community as whole. The Neighborhood Jobs Initiative, for example, as its name suggests, aims to provide so-called saturation services to all residents of selected neighborhoods of entrenched poverty. Similarly, the Jobs-Plus Demonstration offers employment services to all residents in selected public housing projects in areas of high joblessness and welfare receipt. Broad inclusion might need a complex funding strategy in order to overcome TANF eligibility criteria and time limits.

High Visibility and Easy Accessibility. In order to support broad participation, a housing-based employment program can and ought to operate at user-friendly hours, integrating its operation with domestic schedules, and generally becoming omnipresent to a wide range of potential participants. It might also operate certain components, such as peer support groups, around social activities. And it can employ residents as staff, serving both employment objectives and maintaining high visibility.

Aggressive Outreach. Many individuals living in entrenched poverty are unlikely to seek assistance, either having failed before or having been rebuffed by some programs. Those not receiving assistance from TANF or other programs with work requirements are under no mandate to seek assistance. There is also anecdotal evidence that boyfriends and fathers may be resentful of TANF recipients' working and of the services available to them, thwarting recipients' efforts toward self-sufficiency.

Rather than relying only on its visible presence, a program might undertake aggressive outreach, using resident input on design and message, to ensure that all individuals who potentially impact a TANF recipient's ability to sustain employment are made aware of available services, of their eligibility, and, importantly, of the program's explicit interest in their participation.

- **An Environment that Promotes and Supports Work**

The Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) developed the concept of "vocationalizing the housing" to promote employment among individuals with severe barriers to successful employment—formerly homeless single individuals, often with histories of substance abuse or mental illness. Such an environment presents work as a norm, role models who are working play a dominant role in the daily life of the residence and offer a way to pattern one's own journey back to work, and residents can engage in work-related activities at a level and pace congruent with their evolving psychological and rehabilitative circumstance. CSH underscores this approach with a "standing offer of work." Three principles may be exportable to a housing-based employment initiative for welfare recipients.

Role models. It has been hypothesized that when unemployment reaches a critical level in neighborhoods of entrenched poverty, there are too few numbers upon whom to model one's behavior and attitude toward work, too little hope upon which to pin a commitment to work, and too few social and vocational networks to help identify work opportunities. An employment program operating where prospective participants live creates the potential for sustained visibility of both job and training prospects, of acquaintances in similar circumstances "making it", and , importantly, of graduated entry into the world of work.

Single site models offer an intimacy between clients' living arrangements and the opportunity for work experiences. The connection may be somewhat diffused when the employment program and housing are separate. Programs should consider elements of physical design that accentuate contact between "workers" and other residents, including spaces for interaction around employment-related or social events as well as for on-site employment.

Accommodating various and shifting work capacities. Individuals with severe barriers to work may have experienced many failures, and be especially fearful of work but resistant to help. They may need reintroduction to work in graduated steps, as in the traditional supported work model, or in only episodic spells, until they have gained a sufficient foothold on working and are receiving the necessary adjunct services to maintain that position.

Project Match, an employment program in Chicago for extremely disadvantaged individuals, has discovered that the hardest to place may take five years or more to reach an equilibrium of successful work experiences, and that the inventory of barriers changes over time (Wagner et. al, 1998). Some programs, such as the People's Emergency Center for poor, formerly homeless women and children in Philadelphia, begin by helping the client figure out what she wants, and over time introduce a job or training (Bratt and Keyes, 1997). The Center for Employment Training, headquartered in San Jose CA, has developed an open entry/open exit model for training curricula, rather than requiring the client to conform to a set program schedule, wait for the beginning of a new course, or wait for preparatory basic education before beginning other job skills training (Harrison and Weiss, 1998).

The degree of accommodation will depend on the population being served. Housing-based programs have the distinct advantage of offering the persistent presence that enables them to introduce options for participation gradually over time.

Standing offer of work. The concept of meeting the client at whatever level of receptivity he or she presents, and modeling services, including a job-like experience, to reflect that variation, is a feature not uncommon to many programs for the hardest to serve. The standing offer of a wage-paying job may be the critical element that lends legitimacy to that concept and in turn encourages participation among those with multiple barriers or resistance to work. CSH projects have on tap, both on-site and using local employers, a number of work opportunities that can be suited to whatever level of engagement or other constraints residents exhibit at any point in time.

- **Effective Use of Community Connections**

Place-based programs can utilize their connection to community in ways not often available to programs operating in more institutional settings. At the most basic level, such designs can utilize informal relationships with key individuals and community-based organizations to exploit access to local services. Such relationships may also bypass bureaucratic layers, formal interagency agreements, and other funding arrangements that accompany access to resources from other institutions.

This may require that the initiative makes a difference to the community—that significant stakeholders care that it operates there and not somewhere else. Some neighborhoods outright resist housing for low income or special needs populations, and garnering community support may require that the program demonstrate that participants are engaged in productive, socially desirable activity, so as not to be seen as an intrusion, and that community members or local employers sit on advisory boards in order to secure support.

Community development corporations (CDCs) may also operate programs directly, and have collaborated with community colleges, local workforce development and social service agencies, and religious institutions, to access expertise and services. The New Community Corporation in Newark NJ, for instance, created a matrix of providers with a broader mix of missions (e.g., the Urban League, and the Young Father program for ex-offenders) than more traditional, non-community-based providers might have offered.

Place-based employment programs may also be linked to neighborhood revitalization efforts. They may use community and economic development sponsors and local private sector employers, particularly in designated enterprise zones, to take advantage of newly created job opportunities and to access services. They may also help developers fulfill their obligations to hire target populations by crafting apprenticeship and hiring agreements.

Using community-based organizations to develop and operate place-based initiatives is challenging. The more complex inter-organizational relationships become, the greater the difficulties they may pose for effective collaboration. It also requires that local leadership can manage a complex organization, and make corrections, such as reshuffling leadership roles, organizational structure, or training boards and directors, when they cannot. And it requires paying attention to staff capacity, making pay competitive, and attending to career advancement and educational support to achieve it—a new experience for many community-based organizations. (See Harrison and Weiss, 1998, for a detailed discussion of community-based workforce development efforts, and Bratt and Keyes, 1997, for a study of housing and communnity-based self-sufficiency programs in the context of welfare reform).

- **Broad Funding Sources**

Housing-based employment initiatives are by their nature complex creations, likely to require a broad range of funding sources, each of which may have different objectives and present different constraints. A consortium of funding sources is often the best route to overcome the eligibility restrictions of TANF, to serve individuals who may not be considered to be associated with TANF-eligible families, to extend the duration of services beyond TANF time limits, and to underwrite construction or renovation costs to support program objectives.

TANF funds can be extremely broadly applied to pay for short-term interventions, for instance to avoid TANF cash assistance, although longer-term treatment would carry with it either the burden of the TANF time limit or the eligibility criteria designed to restrict participation. There are also a wide variety of funding sources that can be used to support employment and other supportive services within public and subsidized housing. Funding options described below, take stock of a creative mix of funding to underwrite a broader strategy, as well as creative use of TANF funds. In times of TANF surpluses it would be wise to look first to TANF funds to support a broad range of programs for TANF-assisted families and for other families who meet TANF income eligibility standards.

Operating Elements

The following discussion addresses specific features of organization, services and funding that can be considered in developing a housing-based employment initiative. However, several decisions ought to be made, especially regarding the duration of services and requirements for participation, before addressing the details of program design and the hurdles of implementation that inevitably follow.

One threshold decision is whether the housing is intended to be transitional or permanent. While it is possible to apply many of the features in either case, the character of the program may vary considerably under different circumstances. For some families the process of stabilization may be so long that housing designed to be transitional, generally for residency of less than a year, would itself be an impediment to their continued progress. On the other hand, it may benefit some individuals and families, once they are stabilized, to move out of or live apart from an environment permeated, and perhaps stigmatized, by remedial services. The explicit goal of self-sufficiency might even be to move out of subsidized housing altogether (e.g., CommonBond Community in Minneapolis, MN). The Women's Housing and Economic Development Corporation (WHEDCO) in New York City addressed this issue by creating a design aesthetic and mixed tenancy that belies its mission of service support and affordable housing, but a center with full family services adjoins the housing and is readily available.

A related decision is whether the program will in some way limit participation based on motivation or abilities. This is especially important if housing is conditioned on successful work participation. The principles outlined earlier aimed at inclusion. Transitional housing programs often have a highly structured regimen aimed at stabilization (and work) within a year and may screen out individuals who are deemed unlikely to be able to meet those goals. Such programs typically mandate participation, with sanctions that may include the loss of housing, which may also be an impediment to some individuals. Programs may still choose to condition participation on criteria that enhance the chances for successful completion, such as to permit open entry but to impose graduated participation in training and employment services.

Planners might consider mixing transitional and permanent housing to accommodate families who can move quickly and those who cannot. Planners might consider service-enriched models, such as those developed by Beyond Shelter (see Tull,1998), or other configurations, in a variety of housing settings, to respond to the continuing, sometimes episodic service needs of low income families, and importantly, without obligations for participation.

Another threshold decision is whether to attempt to own the space in which the program operates. Site control is reported to be of major importance, made more challenging when those responsible for managing the housing are different from those attempting to implement the service components. Housing concerns, such as building maintenance and timely rent payments, may conflict with other program goals. Also, locating sites for special needs populations continues to be difficult, making Section 8 housing vouchers more attractive and limiting the options for self-contained supportive housing programs.

Program developers should weigh carefully their own philosophical inclinations, program objectives, and the likely effect of different designs on the adults and children they are intending to serve. They should develop a design that is justified by the circumstances within the community, and whose aims can be understood and accepted by community residents, service providers, funding organizations, and prospective participants.

Employment and Training Services

Housing-based programs may offer many of the same job preparedness training, such as soft skills, basic literacy, English as a Second Language (ESL), GEDs, and certification curricula, as well as work-based training, apprenticeships, job search and placement services. Planners should review materials from other employment and training programs for models applicable to their sites.

Housing-based employment projects, however, are uniquely poised to structure work assignments and participation requirements to accommodate the shifting needs and capabilities of those with multiple barriers to work. Individuals may be unevenly receptive to help or able to work only episodically. As in the traditional sheltered workshop model, some housing-based initiatives structure work assignments to introduce the rigors of working gradually over time and in a maximally supportive environment. Sites can also create work experience slots designed to accommodate on-again off-again work patterns of residents as they gradually accommodate to work.

Housing-based programs can also create work experience leading to employment and regular jobs within their own operations. In the Baltimore Jobs-Plus site, the housing authority is using Economic Development and Supportive Services block grant funds (now replaced by the Resident Opportunities and Self Sufficiency Program) to pay salaries and benefits for work experience positions with service providers within the collaborative. Similarly, HUD apprenticeship programs and Welfare-to-Work funds can be used by public housing authorities to train TANF and non-custodial parents and then place graduates in housing or related trade positions.

Some programs have been able to use their own operations to create jobs directly. For example, WHEDCO offers training and employment within their commercial catering operation. The Greyston Foundation in Yonkers NY employs residents in their for-profit bakery, and made job creation a deliberate biproduct of services, such as child care, which they provide. Several projects that CSH has helped launch have created for-profit businesses (e.g., coffee house, bakery, thrift store, landscaping and sporting goods businesses) for the express purpose of employing residents. Others have leased commercial space in their residences—a capability unique to place-based programs—at a discount in exchange for agreements to hire residents.

Similarly, support services that are logically located at place of residence, such as van or carpool services or child day or after-school care, can be configured to be job generating. For example, vanpools created to get participants to work can be used for driver education to enable residents to drive to work or to train and employ them as commercial drivers; family-centered day care can provide a supervised training ground for work in child care. Residents can also provide soft skills training within peer support groups (as in a Jobs-Plus site in Chattanooga), and that training can be transformed into a marketable training package (Riccio, 1999).

Making enterprises economically viable may strain other program objectives. Programs may find it easier to maintain sharp distinctions between their role as trainer and advocate and their role as commercial landlord and broker for job placements.

Another issue concerns the obligations between program and client in the provision of services. For many programs aimed at self-sufficiency, a basic tenet is personal responsibility building, and the relationship between program and client is specified on a contractual basis. Some community-based self-sufficiency programs have used individual employment or self-sufficiency plans as a condition of residency, and make non-compliance a violation of the lease agreement. Some require a minimal payment for certain services as a way of engaging clients in service choices and empowering them to take control of their lives. (See fuller discussion in Bratt and Keyes, 1997). Others avoid making work a condition of residency, either because of legal restrictions or because of philosophical views about how best to encourage participation. Participation requirements may depend in part on whether the employment initiative was an add-on to an

existing residence or whether the housing was provided on condition of participating in the employment program. But linking housing and TANF work requirements may pose additional challenges to both programs' rules. PHAs, for example, can create a preference for working families but cannot condition residency on participation in such programs.

Support Services

In housing-based employment programs the line between employment services and family and support services, in many cases, becomes deliberately blurred.

Programs can intermingle work and social supports, including arrangements in which residents barter services such as child or home care to enable each other to work. These arrangements also become vehicles for supervised training that may then be parlayed into regular work. Residents can also offer babysitting, mentoring or other soft services as a way of supporting each other. And residentially based programs can enlist friends and neighbors to help in emergencies or to provide ongoing crisis intervention for problems, that, felt unimpeded, often lead to erratic work patterns or the need for longer term services.

Programs can also exploit their physical space for on-site and off-hour accessibility to job assistance and family support services. Programs might create "paperwork" nights (as Jobs-Plus in Seattle did) in which residents can deal with job applications, immigration forms and other official letters that require the assistance of program experts but would otherwise depend on daytime visits to an employment program. Formal and informal groups—more easily configured in the ad hoc social commerce of a residential setting—can be used to discuss and overcome hurdles, underscore the work efforts of residents, and celebrate benchmarks of success.

The residential base also offers opportunities to extend the menu of services to include those that address broader family issues or serve other family members. For example, in addition to individual counseling to develop attitudinal and coping mechanisms for job success, programs may offer family counseling to address issues as they impact all family members. Programs may offer access to work-related health services, such as employer-mandated physicals, or services for children or other family members that permit a mother to go to work. Similarly, a disabled family member might be provided caretaker services to enable the TANF recipient to work outside the home. Housing-based programs can also provide mental health and substance abuse treatment, and can offer 24-hour coverage.

Alternative delivery mechanisms. Coordination and delivery of services may be separable. Housing for formerly homeless individuals or recovering alcoholics is often transitional, more concerned with stabilizing fragile lives through counseling, case management, and referral, than providing longer-term services or, often, services in-house. So-called service-enriched housing, such as Beyond Shelter offers, is permanent housing for low income populations who may require sustained or episodic assistance with a variety of family and personal crises. It provides access to services through case management, rather than direct provision of services within the housing setting.

Staffing

Staffing structure depends largely on the size of the program, whether participants are trained or employed directly by the program, and whether employment and other services are delivered directly or whether recipients are primarily referred out. Key questions to address are whether the program will attempt to

integrate housing management and other service functions, employment and other services, and whether it will serve only residents of the housing site or others within the immediate community.

Often housing management and other service functions are somewhat melded, and the melding can work in the service of program objectives. The Corporation for Supportive Housing believes the most successful projects incorporate a "blended management" approach, in which housing and social services are provided by the same organization, thereby creating a stable and well-managed operation. Project New Hope in Los Angeles provides permanent housing and employment services for individuals with HIV/AIDS. They found the need for "enhanced" management to meet residents' service needs that were very high, at least in the first year, and, like CSH, for linking the resident services coordinator and property management staff, and for cross-training in staff roles that were frequently blurred.

A key feature of most housing-based employment initiatives is sustained case management. Case management may be accomplished through a single individual, or backed up by a team of specialists whose expertise can be enlisted as the need arises. It may entail the use of a coordinator of social and employment services for all housing or neighborhood residents. Beyond Shelter uses a team approach between a case manager, responsible for the needs of the family as a whole, and an employment counselor who works exclusively on employment-related issues.

Case managers may live on-site, increasing accessibility and monitoring. Other support functions, such as job coaching, can also be performed by residents, especially useful in multi-language or multi-cultural communities to enhance receptivity to assistance. In the Chattanooga Jobs-Plus Demonstration half the staff are residents (Riccio, 1999).

Case managers in housing self-sufficiency programs may have caseloads of only 20 to 25 families or even smaller, which is hardly typical of TANF agencies but makes it easier to sustain contact with a family. With small caseloads staff can offer a richer array of services than is typical in TANF case management (e.g., in the People's Emergency Center in Philadelphia staff may accompany clients to appointments). In all cases, it is important to coordinate with the case management responsibilities of the TANF agency and avoid duplication or confusion on the part of the program or participants.

Space

Use of space will vary considerably depending on the scale of the operation, whether the program is located in a single or multi-structure site, whether the mission is direct service delivery or providing access and referral through case management, and depending on who owns or controls the space in which the program operates.

In single structure housing, residents can routinely interact in common areas and potentially brush up against available services in the course of their daily lives. In other configurations it may be more difficult to ensure client interaction. Christopher Place, for example, serving homeless men in Baltimore, finds the single housing site necessary to create a total environment designed around work, with a highly structured regimen for participation. Clients are removed from the environments of drugs and crime that created their difficulties in the first place, all maintenance is done by residents, the "work" day is longer, participants can learn to structure their lives, and the program can deal intensively with all aspects of a participant's life.

Whether single structure or otherwise, designs can be mindful of maximizing the use of common spaces to insure readily accessible peer and staff support. Common spaces can be used for residents to meet and share work-related information as well as to house dedicated resources for undisturbed job seeking. Social spaces, resource rooms featuring computer and internet access, spaces for conducting interviews or for private telephone conversations with prospective employers—and for receiving return phone calls—are important features to consider.

Unlike most employment programs in which the program is a tenant in rented space, housing-based employment programs may own their space outright or share common landlords, creating other opportunities for the use of space. This is especially true for programs operating within larger community or economic development initiatives. Some have been able to use surplus public or commercial space that often accompanies public housing in distressed neighborhoods. Such spaces can be renovated and rented for income generation, or office space can be carved out of residential units to house community organizers or service delivery coordinators, or to conduct more effective outreach. Some programs have offered commercial space within the housing site at a discounted rent in exchange for agreements to hire housing residents and program participants. The same arrangement can be offered to community-based organizations who donate services.

Another opportunity for the use of residential space is to develop home-based businesses, such as child care or adult home-care, both to train some participants to be entrepreneurs and to permit other participants to go to work. In Jobs-Plus sites, for example, residents have been helped to bring apartments into compliance and deal with other licensing and liability issues in order to provide such services. The Dayton site has developed a housing-based after school program for resident youth, and uses "building captains" to hire residents and do outreach (Riccio, 1999). Project New Hope, for clients with HIV/AIDS, has developed home-based computer training, especially suited to home-bound individuals with intermittent bouts of illness.

Programs have used a variety of funding sources to purchase, support new construction, and use "master leasing" with a single landlord in order to sponsor individuals in private housing. Project New Hope, which has also had to address the disclosure issue because its clients have HIV/AIDS, has used a mix of approaches. They find that permanent housing is more cost effective, and master leasing allows them to reapply the voucher or certificate if a participant falls out of the program. They also find that sites with more than 25 units are difficult to manage and provide the necessary vocational and other service supports.

Funding

Core funding can come from TANF and from a number of HUD programs. In addition, there are a variety of categorical programs that planners might combine with core funding to serve different subgroups or different purposes within the larger whole.

TANF. To start, states may think broadly about using TANF funds to support programs that aim at greater inclusion. TANF regulations allow very broad flexibility as long as benefits and services meet one of the four purposes of PRWORA: to help needy families care for their children, to reduce dependency through job preparation, work and marriage; to reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies; and to promote two-parent families.

For purposes of this discussion, it is useful to distinguish how to use TANF funds to support activities beyond TANF time limits, from how to support individuals who are outside of TANF-assisted households and/or do not meet TANF eligibility requirements.

With respect to the first, TANF requirements, in particular the 60-month time limit, apply only to TANF funds that provide "assistance"—defined in regulation to include cash payments and ongoing services for basic needs. The requirements do not apply to other services, such as child care or transportation, that support families who are employed, education and training, case management, job search and counseling, subsidies to employers for wages, benefits, training and supervision, or counseling and employment services, or to short-term interventions such as through a diversion program aimed at avoiding long-term cash assistance or at addressing specific crises (not to exceed four months in each episode).

Longer-term treatment, in general, would carry with it either the burden of the TANF time limit or eligibility criteria designed to restrict participation. However, if TANF funds are used to subsidize in-house employment or for services in support of employment, the TANF clock would stop while residents participated in those activities. Also, TANF agencies can exempt 20 percent of their caseload from time limits.

With respect to the second, TANF funds may support services for "needy" families and parents, whether or not they are TANF recipients, and states may set different eligibility standards for different benefits and services, that is, different standards of need. States can accomplish these other purposes—non-"assistance" and assistance to other than TANF-eligible individuals—by segregating state funds within TANF or by operating a separate state program. Assistance to non-custodial parents and others who are not heads of households, and non-cash Welfare-to-Work services do not count as assistance within the time limit. Hence, states could use TANF funds to serve non-custodial "needy" parents in a housing-based employment program, as well as provide supportive services such as child care or home care for a disabled family member to enable a TANF recipient to go to work.

Finally, states must spend at least 80 percent of what they spent in FY 94 if they do not meet work participation requirements (all states did in 1999), or 75 percent if they do. As caseloads have severely declined, there may be greater incentive to meet maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements with innovative programs that can serve more inclusive populations. States can operate separate state programs, which can count toward their MOE requirements, virtually free of TANF restrictions, and allowing for a wide range of services for TANF recipients, TANF eligible families or others, to run in conjunction with a TANF program.

HUD Programs. HUD programs aimed specifically at promoting self-sufficiency can be used to provide services, or may be leveraged to support training or employment programs for residents of public or subsidized housing or other low income residents, and/or in conjunction with community or economic development or empowerment zone activities. HUD funds can used as match or in partnerships, as evidence of collaboration and to create effective local partnerships. HUD has also streamlined the competitive grant notification process, using so-called SuperNOFAs to consolidate funding streams and coordinate applications for federal funds for related program purposes.

Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program. Public Housing Authorities who received additional units of public or tenant-based Section 8 housing between FY93 and FY98, are required to offer educational, job training, counseling, and other supportive services (e.g., child care, transportation, substance abuse

treatment or counseling, household skills training) to interested families, to coordinate public and assisted housing with other public and private resources to help low income families achieve self-sufficiency, and to enroll a specified number of participants in such programs. Resident participation is voluntary. FSS does not carry new funding, but features a program coordinating committee, case management, and escrow accounts to permit rent increases due to increased earnings to be saved for use after welfare. Escrowed savings can also be used at specified points in participants' contracts to pay for work-related expenses (such as college tuition, computers or other education expenses, to buy a car to get to work, to pay off summonses to retain a license, or to pay for dentures or eyeglasses) in order to help individuals fulfill their contracts.

One survey (Rohe and Kleit, 1999) found that the program is underutilized, particularly in smaller PHAs, and understaffed. Further, FSS may have difficulty recruiting participants who fear losing housing or other benefits for lack of performance, though welfare reform may increase motivation to participate. Though the program has not been widely implemented by PHAs, it might still be used in concert with other funding to provide support to residents and PHAs alike (see Sard and Lubell, 1998 and 2000). Since the FSS cannot pay for new services, an employment program operating in public or assisted housing might work with an FSS program to pay for case management, particularly since some programs now contract out for case management, and to exploit the use of the escrow accounts to shelter families' increasing income against loss of housing subsidies. Also, the FSS program mandates that residents and local service providers, including local job and training providers and the local workforce development apparatus, be a part of the coordinating committee, which could provide a base for coordination of services.

Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) Program. ROSS merges the Economic Development and Supportive Services and Tenant Opportunities programs. It can provide funding ($66.6 million in FY99) to PHAs, resident organizations, and other non-profits, for supportive services, resident empowerment activities, resources to enhance independent living for the elderly and disabled, and capacity building and conflict resolution for resident managers. Funding for residential management and business development includes training related to resident-owned businesses, technical assistance for job training and placement, support services, and physical improvements to house these activities. The required 25 percent match may be cash or in-kind.

Funding for residential service delivery models is concerned especially with target subpopulations such as TANF recipients, and would pay for a program coordinator, physical improvements, and case management, as well as a range of employment-related activities (e.g., access to skills and resources for employment, job development, business development, entrepreneurship training, microloans, credit unions, employment training and counseling, employer linkage), and a range of supportive services to help heads of families with children maintain employment. Finally, ROSS offers grants for technical assistance and training to strengthen organizational capacity, in order to enable resident organizations to administer welfare-to-work and other programs, and to develop board and management capabilities through board development and leadership training and training in community organizing.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs). Portions of CDBGs (up to 75 percent of $4.2 billion in FY99) may be used by PHAs and other non-profits for employment and training and supportive services to help residents of assisted housing become self-sufficient.

Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community (EZ/EC). EZ/ECs (in 135 designated areas) receive tax incentives to spur private investment and create jobs. TANF agencies or other non-profits could

collaborate with economic or community developers to fashion employment initiatives, apprenticeships, or hiring agreements within the overall EZ/EC or community revitalization effort.

HOPE VI. This program is designed to revitalize the most distressed public housing developments, has dedicated funds for supportive services, and has been used successfully in several communities to support employment programs to help residents become self sufficient. Projects often access a wide range of services and expertise, leverage other municipal and private funds to create markedly greater funding, and may offer lessons in how to use community-based organizations effectively and develop sustainable partnerships to serve the needs of all members of the community.

Resident Apprenticeship Programs. STEP-UP and other programs offer residents of public housing registered paid apprenticeships, and supportive services, for training and ultimate placement in jobs in the building trades. These programs do not carry additional funding.

Continuum of Care for the Homeless. Three granting authorities for the homeless (the Supportive Housing Program, Shelter Plus Care (S+C) and Section 8 Single Room Occupancy Program) and four other programs including Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), can provide assistance to homeless persons and low to moderate income persons with HIV/AIDS. As with other categorical programs, funds from these programs might be used in conjunction with core funding to support families with special needs within the larger TANF population.

Other Programs. A variety of programs administered by other federal agencies may afford state and local agencies, and non-profits, funding options for housing-based employment initiatives. Chief among them, Welfare-to-Work grants to state and local communities are intended to move the hardest-to-employ TANF recipients into jobs, but may also be used for non-custodial parents or TANF recipients coming to the end of their time limits. Twenty-five percent of program funds are reserved for competitive grants to local governments, Private Industry Councils (PICs)/Workforce Investment Boards and private entities, with special consideration for EZ/EC applicants.

In addition, the purposes of HHS Social Services Block Grant ($1.9 billion in FY99), and Community Services Block Grant ($492 million in FY99) programs are consistent with the purposes of place-based employment initiatives. Planners can coordinate with the local authorities administering these and CDBG funds to get maximum use of block grant funds.

Finally, there are over 200 funding sources in 18 federal agencies that can be used to support community empowerment initiatives (see President's Community Empowerment Board, 1999). Categories that might be directly applicable to housing-based initiatives include access to capital, business assistance, community building, economic development, education, human services and family support, welfare to work and workforce development. Planners might think creatively about how to use categorical programs ((e.g., for disabled veterans (DOL), computers for learning (GSA), anti-drug strategies (DOJ Weed and Seed), job access and reverse commute (DOT), eldercare (HHS)), to support a housing-based employment initiative.

Some Designs in Operation

Beyond Shelter, in Los Angeles, integrates crisis intervention and referral services into permanent "service-enriched housing" for low income families, who generally have been relocated from shelters.

Home-based services coordination can be on-site or part-time serving a number of sites, and use single case managers or a team of, for example, employment counselor and family case manager. The housing base allows them to deal with a range of issues operating in the family and for resident participation in the decision-making process. The intervention is highly individualized so that as a family stabilizes it can move into more normalized, less assisted, permanent housing. They are now extending the model to neighborhood-based services for residents of scattered site Section 8 housing, and have begun a DOL-funded Welfare-to-Work Demonstration grant, using employment counselors for job readiness, education and training, placement and retention services teamed with a case manager for all other family needs. Contact Tanya Tull, 213/252-0772.

Corporation for Supportive Housing has eight sites around the country that combine housing, employment and wrap-around supportive services. Originally developed for single individuals, they are now attempting to develop projects to serve families. Their *Next Step: Jobs* tests a range of housing-based employment strategies, including hiring clients in-house, operating for-profit enterprises, and discounting on-site commercial space in exchange for hiring agreements. It accommodates part-time, flexible, and episodic employment in order for individuals to get a foothold on employment more gradually, and importantly, incorporates a standing offer of work within their operations or in outside placements. The housing-based model uses "blended management" between housing management and social service staff, bundling services across traditional institutional lines and extended over time as necessary. Property ownership and other arrangements allow for control over the site. Contact John Rio, 212/986-2966, ext. 287.

Women in Need (WIN) operates transitional housing along with outpatient substance abuse treatment centers for homeless women with children in New York City. Most residents are TANF recipients. One of their six shelters houses the substance abuse treatment component of the CASAWORKS employment demonstration for TANF recipients. Another is the Sojourner Truth Employment Program (STEP), which provides advanced career exploration and advanced training for the most job ready. Each site has one job specialist for job readiness services, a housing specialist and a counselor/case manager to help the women transition into stable housing and employment. Staff ratios are 1:15 for case management and 1:30 for other services. Shelters house around 16 families in dorm arrangements or, more frequently, private apartments, using communal spaces for computers and other employment resources. They find that the more services provided on site, the better the chances of engaging the client. Although the average housing stay is10 months, they have been a site for limited workfare assignments, and combined funding allows them to continue services through 6 month follow-up (for HUD Continuum of Care program) and frequently beyond. Contact Rita Zimmer, 212/695-4758.

Women's Housing and Economic Development Corporation (WHEDCO) created an historic restoration of a large abandoned municipal hospital in the Bronx, NY to provide permanent housing for 132 low income families, one-third of whom were formerly homeless, and a Community Economic Development Center for residents and others in the community. They offer job services for TANF recipients in a joint venture with AmericaWorks and Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC), for substance abusers through the CASAWORKS demonstration, a family day care training program, Head Start, and other youth, family support and health care services. They operate a culinary arts program that trains for jobs in catering, corporate dining, and in their own non-profit baking and catering service, and a for-profit fitness center (free to everyone in their training programs). WHEDCO was careful to offer services to both residents and community members, to separate physically the social service operations from the housing so that the housing component is regular permanent housing in which residents can partake of services or not as they choose. Contact Nancy Biberman 718/839-1103.

The **Doe Fund** began with New York City funds to purchase and renovate an abandoned building and to train and hire formerly homeless individuals to renovate city-owned apartments. Although many have criminal histories and substance abuse addictions, the program screens for those who are motivated and ready, willing and able to work full time and remain drug-free. Residents begin with life skills training, and then work (under close supervision to observe motivation, ability to follow directions and quality of work) in a range of activities, including a major street cleaning initiative, culinary arts program, apartment repair and renovation, and direct mail, polling, and mailing services for contractors such as Toyota, Citibank and several non-profits. They continue education, training, and individual and group counseling in the evenings. Average stay is 10 months, up to 18 months, with the final phase focused on job placement. Participants begin with a $15 weekly stipend, and once in jobs pay $65 per week for room and board, save $30 per week, and on graduation receive a $1000 matching grant, in five-month installments, with follow-up services. Placements average $10.50 per hour to start. The program is being replicated in Washington, DC and Jersey City, NJ, and the model is being applied to a DOL Welfare-to-Work Demonstration for TANF recipients in public housing. Contact Anne Marie Fell, 212/628-5207.

Acorn Smart Housing is a demonstration (with funding from the City of Oakland CA, IBM, Bridge Housing Corporation, HUD, and US Department of Commerce), which has rehabilitated housing for low income families, many receiving TANF, and is placing computers linked to a learning center in every apartment, for computer literacy, GED, job specific and other computer-based training, and continued internet access. While not a service-oriented housing model, it may offer a model for home-based learning and business development using a mixed funding strategy. Contact Laura Simpson, 510/238-6177.

References

Abt Associates Inc. *The Mixed-Finance Guidebook.* US Department of Housing and Urban Development. December 21, 1998. 617/520-2974. Mixed-finance developments for special needs housing and integrating housing with other program objectives.

Bratt, Rachel G. and Langley C. Keyes. *New Perspectives on Self-Sufficiency: Strategies of Nonprofit Housing Organizations.* Tufts University, 1997. A study of a wide variety of place-based self-sufficiency programs, including details important to successful implementation.

Community Connections. *A Guide to Publications and Services.* October 1999. 800/998-9999.

Dressner, Julianne, Wendy Fleischer, and Kay E. Sherwood. *Next Door: A Concept Paper for Place-Based Employment Initiatives.* Corporation for Supportive Housing. 1998. http://www.chs.org.

Emerson, Jed and Fay Twersky, eds. *New Social Entrepreneurs: The Success, Challenge and Lessons of Non-Profit Enterprise Creation*. Roberts Foundation. 1996. A guidebook on the problems and opportunities in creating startup enterprises for job generation. 415/561-6677 or http://www.redf.org

Glauber, Diane. "The Evolution of Supportive Housing," in *Shelterforce*, Vol. 18, No. 4, July/August 1996. http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/88/suphousing.html or 201/678-3110.

Greenberg, Mark and Steve Savner. *The Final TANF Regulations: A Preliminary Analysis.* Center for Law and Social Policy. May 1999. http://www.clasp.org/pubs/TANF/finalregs.html

Harrison, Bennett and Marcus Weiss, eds. *Networking Across Boundaries: New Directions in Community-Based Job Training and Economic Development.* Economic Development Assistance Consortium, 1998. See Volume 1 for detailed descriptions of New Community Corporation, Newark NJ, and Bethel New Life, Chicago IL. 617/367-0908 or EDACmark@aol.com.

Naparstek, Arthur J., Susan R. Freis, G. Thomas Kingsley, Howard E. Lewis. *HOPE VI: Community Building Makes a Difference.* US Department of Housing and Urban Development. February 2000.

President's Community Empowerment Board. *Building Communities: Together/Federal Programs Guide 1999-2000.* US Department of Housing and Urban Development/US Department of Agriculture. 1999. Provides comprehensive list of federal resources for depressed communities through the EZ/EC initiative. 800/998-9999.

Reynolds, Sue. *Not a Solo Act: Creating Successful Partnerships to Develop and Operate Supportive Housing.* Corporation for Supportive Housing. 1997. http://www.csh.org

Riccio, James A. *Mobilizing Public Housing Communities for Work: Origins and Early Accomplishments of the Jobs-Plus Demonstration.* Manpower Demonstration and Research Corporation. September 1999. http://www.mdrc.org

Rohe, William M. and Rachel Garshick Kleit, "Housing, Welfare Reform and Self-Sufficiency," in *Housing Policy Debate,* Vol. 10, Issue 2. 1999. http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org

Sard, Barbara and Jeff Lubell. *How the Statutory Changes Made by the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 May Affect Welfare Reform Efforts.* Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. December 17, 1998. http://www.cbpp.org

Sard, Barbara and Jeff Lubell. *Outline of How Federal Housing Programs Can Help Provide Employment and Training Opportunities and Support Services to Current and Former Welfare Recipients.* Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Revised January 6, 2000. http://www.cbpp.org/1-6-00hous.htm

Savner, Steve and Mark Greenberg. *The New Framework: Alternative State Funding Choices Under TANF.* Center for Law and Social Policy. March 1997. 202/328-5140.

Schott, Liz, Ed Lazere, Heidi Goldberg, and Eileen Sweeney. *Highlights of the Final TANF Regulations.* Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. April 29, 1999. http://www.cbpp.org/4-29-99wel.htm

Tull, Tanya, ed. *Service-Enriched Housing: Models and Methodologies.* Beyond Shelter. April 1998. 213/252-0772.

US Department of Health and Human Services/Administration for Children and Families. *Helping Families Achieve Self-Sufficiency: A Guide on Funding Services for Children and Families through the TANF Program.* http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/funds2.htm

US Department of Health and Human Services/Administration for Children and Families. *Summary: Final Rule Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program.* http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/exsumcl.htm

Greenberg, Mark H. *Beyond Welfare: New Opportunities to Use TANF to Help Low-Income Working Families.* Center for Law and Social Policy. July 1999. http://www.clasp.org.

US Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Fact Sheet: Family Self-Sufficiency Program.* July 1998. 800/955-2232.

US Deparment of Housing and Urban Development. *From Welfare to Work: Using HUD's Programs to Help Families in Transition.* March 1999. http://www.huduser.org/publications/pubasst/transition.html

US Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Resident Opportunities and Self Sufficiency: Program: Application Kit for ROSS Funding Fiscal Year 1999.* http://www.hud.gov/pih/publications/nofas/rossnofa.html

Wagner, Suzanne L., Toby Herr, Charles Chang and Diana Brooks. *Five Years of Welfare: Too Long? Too Short?: Lessons from Project Match's Longitudinal Tracking Data.* Project Match, Erikson Institute. June 1998. 312/755-2250, ext. 2296/2297.

Resource Contacts

Beyond Shelter. Contact Tanya Tull, 213/252-0772.

Christopher Place. Contact Mary Funke, 410/230-5406.

CommonBond Community, serving TANF families with career and other services within housing developments. Contact Scott Beckman, 651/291-1750.

Corporation for Supportive Housing. Contact John Rio, 212/986-2966, ext 287.

Enterprise Foundation, for technical assistance, training and development of affordable housing and related services. Contact Jay Marcus, 800/624-4298 or http://www.enterprise.com.

Greyston Foundation. Contact Julius Walls, 914/376-3900.

HUD Clearinghouses: Community Connections, for Community Planning and Development, 800/998-9999 or http://www.comcon.org ; Public and Indian Housing Information and Resource Center 800/955-2232; and HUDUSER, Policy Development and Research's Information Service, http://www.huduser.org.

Project New Hope, for use of internet, remote learning and job search tools in housing-based employment services. Contact Scott Figenshow, 213/580-9977 or http://www.projectnewhope.org.

The author wishes to thank especially Debby Greenstein, Toby Herr, Ann O'Rielly, and John Weiler for their helpful review comments, and the many others cited throughout who shared their insights on linking housing and services for promoting self-sufficiency.

The Welfare Information Network is supported by grants from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Woods Fund of Chicago, the McKnight Foundation, the Administration for Children and Families in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of Labor.

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK
1000 Vermont Ave., NW - Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005